

## California Mapping Coordination Committee Meeting Minutes

**Location** Zinfandel Room, 16<sup>th</sup> Floor  
1325 J Street  
Sacramento

**Date** February 15, 2012  
**Time** 9:00 AM –10:30 AM

**WebEx** <https://resources.webex.com/resources/j.php?ED=172721452&UID=491358257&RT=MiM0>

**Telephone** 877.501.2613

**Meeting Number** 747 923 693

**Participant Code** 1661478

Attendees	Organization
Scott Gregory	CTA
Nancy Miller	DWR
Will Patterson	DFG
Christina Boggs	DWR
Greg Smith	DWR
Christy Cox	UCD / BOE
David Harris	CERES
Svetlana Smorodinsky	DPH
Ric Schwarting	BOE
Anna Marie Price	BOE
Monica Markel	CERES
Mark Johnson	CalEMA OIP
Sol McCrea	Conservation
Fiona Renton	DTSC
Allison Joe	OPR
Pat Landrum	Caltrans
Karen Beardsley	UCD
Anne Millington	DPH
Russell Montez	Caltrans
Tiffany Meyer	CalFIRE
Pablo Fung	Conservation
Kit Lai	Conservation
Mateo Yanes	Conservation

Item : Welcome and Updates	
Lead	Scott Gregory
Support Information	
Preparation	
Desired Outcome	
Time Allocation	
Action Items	Welcome and Updates

## 1. Geoportal/Data Portal

- a. California Mapping Coordination Committee (CMCC) Portal Workgroup looked at a number of options and there were some pros and cons to each.
  - i. ArcGIS for Organizations – the team discovered administrators could see other administrator’s private data
  - ii. Google’s Earth Builder – the outputs were very Google product-centric but an upside was the large amount of data available at your fingertips.
  - iii. GeoPortal – an open source application, easily customizable, easily integrates with existing software that many departments have.
- b. The decision was made to go with Geoportal and the plan is to hold focused workgroups like the production process for Geocoding.
  - i. Schedule for the Geoportal has the new portal to be running by the end of August.
  - ii. For the Geoportal contract the amount is \$344,000
  - iii. The maintenance and support on the Geoportal are going to be administered by the California Technology Agency (CTA).
- c. Is there going to be outreach and promotion for this state geoportal?
  - i. Executive promotion?
  - ii. Regional/Department-specific promotion?
  - iii. Yes, this is being done in conjunction with the statewide comprehensive spatial data inventory by the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR).
    1. The first step is to coordinate state-level departments then we’ll move onto regional and local partners. At CalGIS Conference in April, Scott plans on giving an announcement on this topic providing glimpse of the geoportal’s abilities and functions. This promotion is to raise awareness and participation.
  - iv. We should have a consistent message coming from CMCC, CTA and OPR so everyone has a realistic view of when this is to be expected. This message should contain both the bigger picture and the timeline for implementation.
    1. Make sure to include SanGIS, Caltrans and the Strategic Growth Council on these briefings.

- d. This GeoPortal is intended to be a repository of metadata rather than a compilation of data. This would be a way of increasing awareness of data rather than providing a location for data to be stored.
- e. Allison Joe from OPR and Scott Gregory have been working on the data inventory project and can provide answers to any additional questions.

## **2. Geocoding**

- a. At the end of the month the geocoding tool is going to be moved to its final hosting location (San Diego supercomputing center).
- b. One of the complications of this has been software acquisition. Now ESRI products are listed on California Multiple Award Schedule (CMAS) and currently they are working on getting maintenance and training/consulting fees listed. Mike Martinez and Tony Lafferty of ESRI can provide more information on these additions to CMAS, their status and descriptions.
- c. Plan for Geocoding release – BETA release to the larger departments that need batch geocoding to begin testing. Once BETA phase has been completed (testing and bug-check) it will be released for the other departments across the state. After roll-out, Scott is going to be looking for additional data sources that can satisfy the licensing agreements to be able to share the geocoding service with county and local entities.
- d. Scott Gregory talked about looking into a cost sharing system for this. It still needs to be finalized.
- e. The Geocoding service will be available as the following: API, Geocoding web service, and a Front-End Web Client to give a non-GIS accessibility element.
- f. What about security concerns for transmitting sensitive data? Once the security model has been vetted and released it will be posted on the CMCC portal.

## **3. Data Inventory**

- a. Thank you to everyone who has already submitted their inventory.
- b. Redundancy of spatial data is not a surprise. Framework data (boundaries etc.) appears to be much of the data that has been duplicated.
  - i. How do you determine which of the duplicate datasets to use? Go to the authoritative individual.
  - ii. Maybe this committee could release a statement about authoritative data being good and duplicate data is bad. Baker (no reference given) had a paper about duplicate cadastral information. One area of need here in California is duplicative parcel acquisition.
  - iii. Recently a survey of 10-12 state organizations yielded a total of approximately \$750,000 in total licensing costs for parcel data. This shows a need for streamlining the process for getting data into the hands of people that need it.

## **4. Statewide Data Purchases**

- a. Digital Map Products <http://www.digitalmapproducts.com> (LandVision)

- i. **Cost:** \$225,000 for the first year and \$125,000 a year to maintain (for the other 2 years) – paid for by CTA. Contract is in process right now, data should be released mid-march. It would be good to have a workflow developed to benefit from the work of BOE and UCD.
  - ii. **Includes:** complete assessor’s roll (appx. 200 fields) and complete geometry - 3 years, quarterly updates, can share across State of CA and stakeholders (anyone working on a combined state-local or state-federal project) and across webservices.
- b. Elevation Data
  - i. Caltrans has been looking for a consistent measure of statewide elevation data (rather than a patchwork of data qualities). Does this seem like something we should collaborate on? Yes.
  - ii. What about partnering with Federal efforts on elevation data acquisition?
  - iii. Contact Pat Landrum (Caltrans District 11), Harold Feinberg (Caltrans) and Scott Gregory for more details and discussion about this.

## 5. Mobile Template

- a. [http://webtools.ca.gov/Downloads/Mobile\\_Template/](http://webtools.ca.gov/Downloads/Mobile_Template/)
- b. There recently was a mobile computing conference.
- c. Framework Data was a hot topic at this conference, there was discussion about how important getting these framework datasets up and serving them out as web services for ingestion into mobile applications and other GIS web applications.
- d. NSDI identified 7 layers as Framework (high value datasets) and California’s SDI had some additional layers identified.
- e. Scott Gregory talked about the future of the Mobile Template, designing it to use spatial data services provided by the state.

## 6. Federal Geospatial Platform

- a. The Federal government has deployed an ArcGIS for Organizations (<http://www.geoplatform.gov/home/>) and they’re going to be made available for state government agencies to use.
  - i. The State of California can have our own group to work within this framework.
  - ii. CMCC folks, please take a look at this geospatial platform and give some feedback to Scott.
    - 1. This can host data and offer a place to build web services and to share content over the web. WMS and WFS (different types of web services) can be developed using this portal. There are size limitations on what can be hosted here. ESRI has described this as a “95% solution” so it’s a work in progress.
  - iii. This portal is scheduled for funding to 2014.
  - iv. Uses ArcGIS for Organizations structure/platform.

- v. Some of Scott Gregory's concerns about this during his review include
  - 1. Size Limitations
  - 2. Security
  - 3. Interoperability
  - 4. Administration of Groups

## Item 2: CMCC Charter Discussion

Lead Scott Gregory

Support Information

Preparation

Desired Outcome

Time Allocation 5 minutes

Action Items

<https://cagis.water.ca.gov/charter>

Please continue the discussion here. Scott will send an email out about this.

*Charter things to do from Last Meeting's Minutes:*

- *Add more structure to CMCC*
- *Add more support roles: Vice, Secretary*
- *Need to add explicitly that the Chair is the State GIO.*
- *II B4 – Nominations for...and the vice chair...not worded correctly.*
- *Scott - Members should be designated as representatives, for them to vote on issues.*
- *Do we want to be the senate or the house? Do we want a set number of votes per department or do we want to base the number of votes on the size of the organization?*
- *Caltrans created a report on the value added by GIS. The business needs should be met.*
- *The Charter should describe the responsibilities. The most important part is the responsibility, that the designated individuals be engaged.*
- *There could be a requirement that the person designated have a functioning background in GIS.*
- *Consider defining GIS. Is this all geospatial information? CAD? Define the scope of what is going to be coordinated by this group.*
- *Goals that could be added: Seek standards, seek improvement of economies of scale and improving spatial data infrastructure.*
- *If our goal is to create a database then we should have it in the goals.*
- *We may have outlived our title.*
- *Are we trying to improve capabilities of GIS in the state? What is our mission? Is our vision interoperable GIS data across the state? What is our implementation plan?*
- *Strategic planning for this group would be valuable.*
- *Let's modernize the charter.*
- *We can refer to the Governor's charter on California geospatial progress, we can refer to this for some input.*

**Item 4: Wrap Up**

Lead Scott Gregory

Support Information

Preparation

Desired Outcome

Time Allocation 5 minutes

Action Items

**Next Meeting is March 8<sup>th</sup> 2012**